



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,415	11/26/2003	Taketo Yoshii	742406-22	6586
7055	7590	11/30/2005	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			BAROT, BHARAT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/721,415	YOSHII ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bharat N. Barot	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 10-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/548,744.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. New claims 10-18 remain for further examination.

The new grounds of rejection

2. Applicants' amendments and arguments with respect to claims 10-18 filed on September 16, 2005 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Statutory Double Patenting

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101, which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 10-18 of this application conflict with claims 19-24 of Application No. 10/756,425. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one

application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

5. Claims 10-18 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 19-24 of copending Application No. 10/756,425. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the copending Application No. 10/756,425 and is covered by the copending Application No. 10/756,425 since the copending Application No. 10/756,425 and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

The claimed invention in the instant application (claims 10-15) is same as the claimed invention in the copending Application No. 10/756,425 (claims 19-24) by deleting the steps of receiving an application transmitted via a digital broadcast before the both steps of registering. No new invention or new improvement is being claimed in the instant application (claims 10-15).

The claimed invention in the instant application (claims 16-18) are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 10-15 above, since claims 16-18 are

Art Unit: 2155

merely a program product for the method of operation defined in the claims 10-12 and an apparatus defined in the claims 13-15.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application, which matured into a copending Application. [Based on 8-38] See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ahmed et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,432).

Ahmed's patent meets all the limitations for claims 10-18 recited in the claimed invention.

9. As to claim 10, Ahmed et al teach an event sending method for a digital broadcasting receiver (ITC server) that sends an event corresponding to an input from a user (client) operation of a remote control to an application running in the digital

broadcasting receiver (see abstract; figures 3 and 7; column 10 line 60 to column 11 line 32; and column 14 line 57 to column 15 line 56), comprising:

registering first application determining information in the digital broadcasting receiver based on first receivable event information, the first receivable event information identifies which event corresponding to an input from the user can be received by a first application capable of executing a process based on the event identified in the first receivable event information in the digital broadcasting receiver; registering second application determining information in the digital broadcasting receiver based on second receivable event information, the second receivable event information identifies which event corresponding to an input from the user can be received by a second application capable of executing a process based on the event identified in the second receivable event information in the digital broadcasting receiver (figure 7; column 14 line 57 to column 15 line 56; and column 50 line 59 to column 51 line 16);

sending the event corresponding to the input from the user to the first application when the first application determining information identifies that the event corresponding to the input from the user can be received by the first application; and sending the event corresponding to the input from the user to the second application when the second application determining information identifies that the event corresponding to the input from the user can be received by the second application (figures 8-11; and column 15 line 57 to column 17 line 56).

10. As to claims 11-12, Ahmed et al teach that the first application alters the first application determining information based on a running status of the first application; and the second application alters the second application determining information based on a running status of the second application (figures 12-15; and column 17 line 57 to column 24 line 10).

11. As to claims 13-18, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 10-12 above, since claims 13-15 are merely an apparatus for the method of operation defined in the claims 10-12 and claims 16-18 are merely a program product for the method of operation defined in the claims 10-12.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. The examiner has attempted to answer (response) to the remarks (arguments) in the body of the Office action.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot
Art Unit 2155

November 22, 2005

Bharat Barot.
BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER